

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

CHARLESTON DIVISION

TRAVIS R. NORWOOD,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:20-cv-00299
2:20-cv-00350

BETSY JIVIDEN, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Complaint. (ECF No. 4.) By Standing Order entered on January 4, 2016, and filed in this case on May 21, 2020, (ECF No. 5), this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation for disposition ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Tinsley filed his PF&R on February 28, 2023, recommending the Court grant Defendants' motion to dismiss, deny Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint, decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims, and dismiss this case and its consolidated companion case, *Norwood v. Jividen, et al.*, Civil Action No. 2:20-cv-299, for the same reasons. (ECF No. 69.)

This Court is not required to review, *de novo* or under any other standard, factual or legal conclusions contained within the PF&R to which no objections were addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and Plaintiff's right to appeal this Court's order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v.*

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).

Objections to the PF&R were due on March 17, 2023. To date, Plaintiff has not filed any objections. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R, (ECF No. 69), **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion to dismiss, **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion to amend, **DECLINES** to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s state law claims, and **DISMISSES** the two consolidated cases. The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this matter from the Court’s docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: March 23, 2023



THOMAS E. JOHNSTON, CHIEF JUDGE